STEPHEN C. JOHNSON (State Bar No. 145210)
HEATHER M. NOELTE (State Bar No. 180243)
DEMPSEY & JOHNSON P.C.
1880 Century Park East, Suite 516
Los Angeles, California 90067-1605
Telephone: (310) 551-2300
Facsimile: (310) 551-2301
scjohnson@dempseyjohnson.com
hnoelte@dempseyjohnson.com
Attornevs for Plaintiff NEW AMSTERDAM

Attorneys for Plaintiff NEW AMSTERDAM PROJECT MANAGEMENT HUMANITARIAN FOUNDATION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NEW AMSTERDAM PROJECT MANAGEMENT HUMANITARIAN FOUNDATION, a Dutch non-profit corporation

Plaintiff,

V.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

KELLY M. LAUGHRIN, CAMPBELL, WARBURTON, FITZSIMMONS, SMITH, MENDELL & PASTORE a California corporation; and DOES 1 through 25,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: C07-00935 HRL

STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER CLARIFYING CIVIL MINUTE ORDER REFERRING PARTIES TO SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE BEFORE MAGISTRATE JUDGE LLOYD

Plaintiff New Amsterdam Project Management Humanitarian Foundation ("NAF") and Defendants Kelly Laughrin and Campbell Warburton, Fitzsimmons, Smith Mendell & Pastore ("Defendants"), by and through their respective attorneys of record, hereby stipulate and agree with reference to the following facts:

A case management conference was held on August 31, 2007 before the Honorable Jeremy Fogel. The parties were ordered to contact Magistrate Judge Howard Lloyd's office regarding setting up an early settlement conference.

A further case management conference was held on October 12, 2007 before the Honorable Jeremy Fogel. At the further case management conference, the parties advised the Court that (1) settlement discussions would be futile without first obtaining documents from the defendants and taking the deposition of Kelly Laughrin; and (2) because the defendants are attorneys, certain discovery disputes pertaining to, among other things, claims of privilege, required resolution in order for there to be meaningful discovery. Accordingly, the Court continued the case management conference to February 8, 2008, so that motions could be heard by Magistrate Judge Lloyd prior to setting up an early settlement conference.

On October 12, 2007 the Court issued Civil Minutes indicating that the "parties are referred to court mediation." The Civil Minutes further reflect that the matter was "re-referred to Magistrate Judge Howard R. Lloyd for settlement conference."

On October 24, 2007, an ADR Phone Conference was conducted by Howard A. Herman, wherein Mr. Herman questioned the parties as to whether they had been referred to mediation or to a settlement conference with Magistrate Judge Lloyd. The parties clarified that the parties had agreed to a settlement conference after resolution of discovery disputes and conducting discovery. Mr. Herman stated that a stipulation and proposed order would be necessary to clarify the Court's October 12, 2007 minute order, which referred to both mediation and settlement conference.

THEREFORE,

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED, subject to the approval of the Court, that the Civil Minutes dated October 12, 2007 be clarified by striking the reference to mediation.

S:\35099\004\HMN10247P1.STIP.doc

1	DATED: October 2,2007 DEMPSEY & JOHNSON P.C.
2	The same
3 4	By: HATHER M. NOELTE Attorneys for Plaintiff
5	NEW AMSTERDAM PROJECT
	MANAGEMENT HUMNAITARIAN
6	PROJECT
7	
8	DATED: October <u>30</u> , 2007 ROPERS, MAJESKI, KOHN & BENTLEY
10	[1121.11.10]
11	By: //U/J/M /// KICHARD M. WILLIAMS
12	Attorneys for Defendants,
13	KELLY M. LAUGHRIN, CAMPBELL WARBURTON, FITZSIMMONS, SMITH,
14	MENDELL & PASTORE
15	
16	[PROPOSED] ORDER
17	Good cause appearing therefore:
18	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Civil Minutes dated October 12, 2007 are
19	hereby clarified to reflect that the parties have not been ordered to mediation, but
20	rather this Court has ordered them to attend a settlement conference before Magistrate
21	Judge Howard Lloyd after resolution of their discovery issues.
22	
23	
24	
25	DATED:11/8/07 By:
26	HON. JEREMY FOGEL JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
27	
28	
	3
	STIPULATION AND PROPOSED ORDER